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Evaluation

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Rating | Evidence | Recommendations |
| 1 | C | BioEngineering transfer science courses are confusing | Update to clarify - 3 courses and/or sequence also add info on non-articulated courses are transferred esp in the degree  Include info on how often they meet with faculty mentor  Check the online information make sure there is nothing to indicate that all engineering programs are accredited when BIEN is not |
| 1 | C | BIEN 1, 2, 101, 201 - when implemented? | Indicate when they will/have started |
| 1 | C | Not clear why the English Composition requirement would vary and how to verify they meet it | Update to clarify |
| 2 | C/W | Focus on what they do, and after 3-5 years experience not what they have a foundation in or capability for | Consider updates similar to notes in self study |
| 2 | C/W | Be specific about the various organizations - | Eg. Grad Schools, Employers, Government |
| 2 | C/W | Most of the constitutencies need more than 1 of the PEO’s | Start with constituency, then needs, then PEO |
| 2 | W | Broad use of constutencies - Mention who involved in revision of PEO’s  Write a procedure for revising them | Include a date/timeframe when faculty/advisors etc involved |
| 2 | C | In surveys, always ask for importance, comments, forced comments at a low score - ask PEO’s for importance, achievement, and comments  OK to ask about a-k, but be sure to do PEO and clear about the difference | Next survey include importance, too  Create employer survey - advisory board meetings (annual better) Informally ask (and document when employers are on campus to interview) |
| 3 | C | Modify a-k to reflect program criteria too | OK - cleaner to add to the list |
| 3 | O | Two column list linking PEO’s to SO’s | OK - more common to do a grid |
| 4 | W | Page 37 - describe what you did, based on X data at the Y meeting we chose to focus on outcomes d, e, f, and PEO #2. Then what did you actually did or when will happen. Don’t say possible solution- in Winter 2012 section we will change Z | Looking for 3-6 examples closed loop cycles for both PEO’s and SO’s although measure, evaluate, implement, measure - peo’s may not have final measure. For review build a timeline with back up material for each |
| 4 | W | Only alumni surveys | Include employers, grad school, |
| 4 | C | Define process | After CHE/ENV updates their flowchart, steal it. |
| 4 | C | Only Ratings - hard to set priorities, know what to change | Include importance and comments in surveys |
| 4 | C/W | SO measurement - professors faculty not listed | Include 5 ways including faculty |
| 4 | W | Language makes it appear that no changes have been implemented | Include the quarter implemented for PEO & SO |
| 4 | O | I’d prefer to keep EBI 1-7 scale rather than lose date to convert to 5 scale | OK to convert |
| 4 | W | Conversion from pass fail to letter grade to assess achievement (BIEN 10) | Don’t use grades to measure achievement |
| 4 | C/W | Most of measures are indirect (survey) or ad hoc (professor) may want to add a direct sampling based on specific student work |  |
| 4 | O | Table for credits | Steal the format from Chem/Env |
| 4 | O | May want to reduce the sampling of student work for SO’s | Could be unsustainable |
| 5 | O | You’d expect many courses to support PEO’s and SO’s | Helpful to informally designate primary ones |
| 5 | C/W | You may need to explain a transcript from old catalog - Include the syllabus for Stat and CS course as well as tech electives (and required) in self study | Develop case for STAT as part math part Eng |
| 5 | C | Usually table 5 shows hours not x in each category & check for design | Update table - split the hours in STAT 155 |
| 6 | C |  | Exp of final design instructor |
| 6 | O | Put tables 6-1 and 6-2 closer to where they are referenced. Only 10 of 11 are in table 6-1, only 9 of 11 are in table 6-2 | Update and move tables  Include grad courses in ed list and % |
| 7 | O | Put some info in the main body - don’t just reference the appendix | Update description |
| 7 |  | Missing some information. |  |
|  |  |  | Make your evaluator and others wear the safety equipment during lab tour |
| 7 | O | Bio Eng lab - Age of computers not included or hours and which students | Put in a year, you’ll be asked how old |
| 7 | C | How do you insure that safety instruction is complete before labs?  Include in C. Guidance | This could be a big deal, review in beginning course, and review before lab, post on wall is OK. |
| 8 | W?? | There is very little in this section to evaluate | Just write it |
| 8 | W | Explosive growth, can you meet the demand? maybe in criteria 1 limiting enrollment |  |
| Program | W? | Laundry List |  |
| Program | W??  D??? | Very little data in self study - Hard to tell, topics or experience teach design? | Do a grid with the prog req and courses and another with course, professor and experience  Most likely area for a do not accredit finding |
| Other | O | Template description information is not needed | Remove the descriptions that came with the template |
| Other | O | Include course names with numbers - easier to read | Update through out |
| Apdx A | W(3,5) | Few if any include 6B Student Objectives | Update |
| Apdx B | C/W | Only 10/11 included - experience for design? | Update |
| Apdx C | O | Need remaining facilities info |  |
| Apdx D | W | D2 is missng | Update |
| Apdx E | C | Like approach - A lot to measure - Some parts are incomplete  Pick and schedule the changes, don’t just recommend. Include what and when | Can it be maintained? |
| Apdx F | O | OK |  |
| Apdx G | O | Some missing, focus on implementation, not just plans | Update |